



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/776,191	02/02/2001	Edwin L. Madison	24745-1607	3237

24961 7590 06/23/2004

HELLER EHRMAN WHITE & MCAULIFFE LLP
4350 LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE
7TH FLOOR
SAN DIEGO, CA 92122-1246

EXAMINER

PAK, YONG D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1652

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/776,191

Applicant(s)

MADISON ET AL.

Examiner

Yong D Pak

Art Unit

1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-116 and 118-136 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-116 and 118-136 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-116 and 118-136 are pending.

Claim 36 occurs twice. Claims have been renumbered as 1-136.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-14, 16-20, 34-36, 40-42, 56-57, 72-75, 91, 108-109, 113-114, 127-129, drawn to a MTSP protein, classified in class 435, subclass 212.
- II. Claims 15, 21-31, 58-67, 76-85, 92-101, 130, drawn to a DNA encoding a MTSP protein, vector comprising said DNA, cell comprising said DNA and a method of producing said protein, classified in class 435, subclass 212.
- III. Claims 32, 68, 86, 102, drawn to an antisense of the DNA of Invention II, classified in class 536, subclass 24.5.
- IV. Claims 33, 69, 87-88, 103, drawn to an antibody against the protein of Invention I, classified in class 530, subclass 387.9.
- V. Claims 37-39, 110-112, drawn to a composition comprising an inhibitor of Invention I classified in class 514, subclass 789.
- VI. Claims 43-55, 115-116, 118-126, drawn to a method of identifying compounds that modulate/bind the protein of Invention I, classified in class 435, subclass 18.

Art Unit: 1652

- VII. Claims 70-71, 89-90, 104-105, 134-136, drawn to a method of treating/preventing neoplastic disease with an inhibitor of the protein of Invention I, classified in class 514, subclass 789.
- VIII. Claims 106-107, drawn to a transgenic animal, classified in class 800, subclass 8.
- IX. Claims 131-133, drawn to a method of treating tumors with a prodrug cleavable by the protein of Invention I, classified in class 514, subclass 789.

Applicants are required to elect ONE MTSP protein or ONE DNA sequence encoding a MTSP protein. For example, applicants can elect Invention I with a further election of MTSP of SEQ ID NO:2.

This is not an election of species. The MTSP proteins and DNA encoding MTSP proteins are independent chemical entities and require independent search in the patent and non-patent literature. The DNA sequences of Inventions I are patentably distinct as encoding enzymes with different structures, functions, substrate specificities, and utilities (i.e. substrate specificity, pH optimum, etc). The proteins of Inventions II are patentably distinct as having different structures, functions, substrate specificities, and utilities (i.e. substrate specificity, pH optimum, etc).

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Art Unit: 1652

Inventions I-V and VIII are patentably distinct because a protein, DNA, antisense, antibody, inhibitor and a transgenic animal are different compounds, each with its own chemical structure and function, and they have different utilities.

The DNA molecules of invention II is not limited in use to the production of polypeptide of invention I, respectively, and can be used as a hybridization probe, and protein of Invention I can be obtained by a materially different method such as by biochemical purification.

Inventions I and (VI) are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the protein of Invention I can be used for the production of the antibodies against the protein.

The methods of Inventions VI-VII and IX are patentably distinct as directed to materially different methods employing different products. Invention VI uses test compounds and the protein of Invention I. Invention VII uses an inhibitor of the protein of Invention I. Invention IX uses a prodrug.

The methods of Inventions VI-VII and IX are patentably distinct because the methods have different effects and utilities.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and

recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is

Art Unit: 1652

found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**


Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yong Pak whose telephone number is 571-272-0935. The examiner can normally be reached 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapu Achutamurthy can be reached on 571-272-0928. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9307 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-1600.

Yong D. Pak
Patent Examiner


PONNATHAPU ACHUTAMURTHY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600